APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,482	06/28/2001	David D. Kloba	1933.001000C	4624

26111	7590	03/28/2005

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
WON, MICHAEL YOUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Supplemental Office Action Summary		09/892,482	KLOBA ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Michael Y Won	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 February 2005</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2 and 6-26</u> is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2 and 6-26</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 2 and 6-26 have been examined and are pending with this action.

2.   Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112, first and second paragraph have been

withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1 and 6-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Narayanaswami (US 6,182,113 B1) in view of King et al. (US 6,353,839 B1).

INDEPENDENT:

As per *claim 9*, Narayanaswami teaches of a computer program product

comprising a computer useable medium including control logic stored therein, said

control logic enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, said control

logic comprising; creating means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to

create a bookmark to a first Web page (see col.1, lines 33-35 and col.4, lines 46-51);

surfing means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to surf to a second

Web page (see col.4, lines 13-18); invoking means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to invoke said bookmark, thereby navigating to said first Web page (see col.1, lines 39-41); and submitting means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to submit to establish said second Web page as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach of generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser. King teaches of generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser (see col.11, lines 57-62).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of King within the system of Narayanaswami by implementing enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page; said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser within the computer program product for enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices because King teaches that by employing such means, it allows the user to easily navigate to previously viewed contents (see col.11, lines 60-62) which overcomes some of the deficiencies encountered with handheld mobile devices (see col.1, lines 47-51).

As per *claim 14*, Narayanaswami teaches a method for a user to operate with

channels for mobile devices, comprising the steps of: (1) creating a bookmark to a first

object/resource (see col.1, lines 33-35 and col.4, lines 46-51); (2) surfing to a second

object/resource (see col.4, lines 13-18); (3) invoking said bookmark, thereby navigating

to said first object/resource (see col.1, lines 39-41); and (5) submitting to establish said

second object/resource as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach (4) reviewing an automatic channel

form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second object/resource, said

URL having been determined via interaction with a browser. King teaches (4) reviewing

an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second

object/resource, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser (see

claim 9 rejection above).

As per *claim 15*, Narayanaswami teaches of a computer program product

comprising a computer useable medium including control logic stored therein, said

control logic enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, said control

logic comprising: creating means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to

create a bookmark to a first object/resource (see col.1, lines 33-35 and col.4, lines 46-

51); surfing means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to invoke said

bookmark, thereby navigating to said first object/resource (see col.1, lines 39-41); and

submitting means for enabling a processor, responsive to user input, to submit to

establish said second object/resource as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6,

lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach reviewing means for enabling a processor to display an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second object/resource, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser. King teaches reviewing means for enabling a processor to display an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second object/resource, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser (see claim 9 rejection above).

As per *claim 16*, Narayanaswami teaches a method for a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, comprising the steps of: (1) surfing to a web page (see col.4, lines 13-18); (2) invoking a link (see col.1, lines 39-41); and (4) submitting to establish said web page as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach (3) reviewing an automatic channel form created in response to step (2) that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser. King teaches (3) reviewing an automatic channel form created in response to step (2) that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser (see claim 9 rejection above).

As per *claim 21*, Narayanaswami teaches of a computer program product comprising a computer useable medium including control logic stored therein, said control logic enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, said control logic comprising: surfing means for enabling a processor to surf to a web page in response to user input (see col.4, lines 13-18); invoking means for enabling a processor

to invoke a link in response to user input (see col.1, lines 39-41); and submitting means for enabling a processor to establish said web page as a channel in response to a user having submitted (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33). King teaches

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser. King teaches generating means for enabling a processor to generate an automatic channel form that is pre-populated with at least a URL of said web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser (see claim 9 rejection above).

As per *claim 26*, Narayanaswami teaches a method for a user to operate with channels for mobile devices, comprising the steps of: (1) creating a bookmark to a first Web page (see col.1, lines 33-35 and col.4, lines 46-51); (2) surfing to a second Web page (see col.4, lines 13-18); (3) invoking said bookmark, thereby navigating to said first Web Page (see col.1, lines 39-41); and (5) submitting to establish said second Web page as a channel (see col.1, lines 35-37 and col.6, lines 32-33).

Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach (4) reviewing an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser. King teaches (4) reviewing an automatic channel form that was pre-populated with at least a URL of said second Web page, said URL having been determined via interaction with a browser (see claim 9 rejection above).

DEPENDENT:

As per *claims 2, 10, 17, and 22*, Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach

wherein said URL is determined using a script in said first Web page. King teaches

wherein said URL is determined using a script in said first Web page (see col.2, lines 6-

9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to employ the teachings of King within the system of

Narayanaswami by implementing determining URL by scripts within the method and

program product for enabling a user to operate with channels for mobile devices

because King teaches that the scripts considers "user supplied information when

displaying a hypermedia page" (see col.2, lines 6-9), which allows appropriate

corrections or modifications to be made to the web page when the mobile device cannot

handle an original web page due to limited memory, disk space, or processing power.

As per *claims 6, 11, 18, and 23*, Narayanaswami further teaches wherein said

URL of said second Web page is determined using a header (see col.5, lines 31-38).

As per *claims 7, 12, 19, and 24*, Narayanaswami does not explicitly teach

wherein said automatic channel form contains fields identifying any combination of a

title and URL of a Web page, a maximum channel size, a link depth, whether images

are to be included, whether to follow off-site links, and when to refresh. King teaches

wherein said automatic channel form contains fields identifying URL of a Web page (see

col.11, lines 58-60)

As per *claims 8, 13, 20, and 25*, Although Narayanaswami does not explicitly

teach of automatic channel (see claim 9 rejection above), Narayanaswami further does

teach of further comprising the step means of modifying settings (see col.3, lines 7-12

and 13-17).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect the *Sugiarto* et al. (US 6,279,448), *DuFresne*

(US 5,835,712), and *Davis* et al. (US 6,138,155) references have been considered

regarding the limitation of "an automatic channel form (that was) pre-populated with at

least a URL of said second Web page" as recited in independent claims. However, the

argument is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael Y Won whose telephone number is 571-272-

3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 7AM-5PM.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain T Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Won

March 24, 2005

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER